DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 625 JC 690 146

By-Israel, Jack W.

Innovation in Evaluation: Teacher Assessment by Objectives.

Pub Date 18 Mar 69
Note-29p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.55
Descriptors-•Evaluation Methods, •Junior Colleges, •Learning, •Teacher Evaluation

If education is meant to change students' attitudes and actions, good teaching must be defined to achieve this goal and to improve instruction. Evaluation allows the teacher to identify his goals with those of the institution and to know the status of his skills, attitudes, and knowledge in relation to it. Sound evaluation makes goal achievement more effective by identifying strengths to be reinforced and weaknesses to be corrected. The literature covers various ways to observe and assess teachers; the author offers a proposal based on their common elements. It combines selected goals for the learner and an assessment of the attributes of the teacher. The goals must be developed cooperatively by teacher and administrator, for, without agreement on those, they can have no agreement on procedures or judgments, or on acceptable evidence of the teacher's success in reaching the goals of learner behavior. The teacher's skills, attitudes, and knowledge must remain flexible, to be adjusted or modified as required, helping him to develop over time and to seek advice more readily. If acceptable evidence of student attainment is predetermined, judgment will shift from procedures to results and, with constant modification and clarification, evaluation will become more precise. Since, in some cases, teachers may feel threatened and oppose this plan, the author describes three alternative ways of implementing it. The methods vary in both philosophy and organization. (HH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED029625

INNOVATION IN EVALUATION:

TEACHER ASSESSMENT BY OBJECTIVES

Submitted in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements
of Education 431
for
Dr. Arthur M. Cohen

JC 690 146

By

Jack W. Israel

March 18, 1969

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 19 1969

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Purposes of Evaluation	2
III.	Problems in Evaluation	4
IV.	Contributions to the Field of Evaluation	7
V.	Proposal for an Evaluation Technique	12
VI.	Alternative Methods of Implementation	15
VII.	Summary	24
	Bibliography	25

I. Introduction

In the world in which we live and work, it is becoming increasingly important that the performance of the individual be evaluated as it relates to the goals of the organization he serves. Good defines evaluation as the "consideration of evidence in the light of value standards and in terms of the particular situation and the goals which the group or individual is striving to attain (14). This suggests, for the field of education, a necessity to find out what good teaching is. It is in this context that evaluation assumes a role of great importance.

This paper will deal with the purposes of evaluation, the difficulties involved in evaluation of employee performance, the contributions of writers in the field to the problem of evaluation, a proposal of a method of evaluation for the appraisal of teacher performance, and the proposal of three alternative methods for implementing a proposed method of evaluation. It is the intent of this paper to present differing views as expressed by a variety of writers from many different fields of specialty. From this diversity of opinion will be sought threads of continuity that emerge and which may form the basis upon which an evaluation proposal can be built.

II. Purposes of Evaluation

Evaluation in some form is present in all organizations because any activity with purposes logically demands an assessment of the degree to which the purposes are being met and the effectiveness of the means which are being employed to achieve the purposes. Fawcett says that "evaluation of personnel in an organization is essential to the accomplishment of its goals (12)." Bloom states a major assumption of evaluation that must be made: Education exists for the purpose of changing the thoughts, feelings, and actions of students so that the students are different as a result of their experiences, and evaluation is conducted to appraise the extent to which the teacher is producing these changes in students (6). It may be said from this premise that it is imperative that the field of education determine what good teaching is in order that the goals of education may be achieved and improved instruction in the classroom may result.

McNeil points out that more than one-half of the nation's teachers report no confidence in their school system's program of teacher evaluation (21). This feeling is complicated by the teacher's need to be evaluated in order to identify his goals with the goals of the organization. In order to do this, he wants to know the status of his skills, attitudes, and knowledge as they relate to the organization. Odiorne states that

"effective appraisal of a man's performance and potential will improve his effectiveness (22)."

In addition to the identification of a teacher's goals with the goals of the organization, good personnel practices dictate that satisfactory evaluation of teacher quality is mandatory for effectiveness. Evaluation must be the basis for systematic and equitable personnel decisions and administrative actions. McGregor proposes that the personnel evaluation program should meet three needs: (a) provide systematic judgments to back up salary increases, promotions, transfers, and sometimes demotions or terminations, (b) provide a means of telling a subordinate how he is doing and suggesting needed changes in his behavior, attitudes, skills, or knowledge, (c) provide a basis for counseling the individual in reinforcement or redirection of his behavior (20). Stahl maintains that if the evaluation procedure is to have the effect of achieving the organization's goals, it must be done in a manner that seeks to maintain or improve the person's performance and that assures reasonable equity and dignity in human relationships (27).

It seems to be generally agreed that an effective program of evaluation should improve the effectiveness of goal achievement. This involves seeing that strengths are discovered and maintained and that weaknesses are identified and minimized or eliminated. This process may lead to modification of goals or purposes, may result in better decisions and plans for achieving the goals, and may culminate in more effective contributions by the members of the organization.

III. Problems in Evaluation

Writers in the field have pointed out that there are many specific problems involved in the common methods of evaluation: rating forms, teacher behavior, teacher characteristics, and pupil gain. These problems are divided into two categories by Odiorne. One category is called the halo effect. In this category the evaluator has a tendency to evaluate the employee on the basis of past record, compatibility, no complaints bias, and effect of past record. In the hypercritical category, on the other hand, the evaluator is likely to be influenced by the employee's being a member of a weak team, by his own sense of perfectionism, by an employee who is different or a maverick, or by a self-comparison with the employee (22). It seems evident that the problems encountered are very real and that continued research is needed which will provide management with the skills necessary to use evaluation as a means for reaching the objectives of the organization.

Numerous attempts to predict teacher effectiveness have reached a dead end because of problems encountered in developing a suitable criterion by which to measure that effectiveness. Good's definition has within it areas which cause considerable concern. What evidence is to be considered and in light of what value standards? Accepting the premise that teacher competence should be measured in terms of pupil growth, many

researchers have spent uncountable hours minutely analyzing teacher performance in the classroom. Sorenson points out that to attempt to define teaching success in terms of some single fixed teacher-ideal is both untenable and inappropriate. Differences in educational values inevitably mean differences in what teachers are expected to do. As a result, teachers are bound to be regarded differently by persons with varying concepts of the teacher's role (26). Popham proposes that many raters are concerned with only the instructional means the teacher employs, without any consideration of the ends the teacher is trying to achieve. In this case, the teacher may be seen in light of the evaluator's personal standards regarding what form classroom activities should take (23).

The problems in evaluation of teacher performance have led Lucio to state that the methods currently used yield results which do not correlate highly, hence they do not measure the same aspects of performance (18). Because of this situation, it would seem that administrators seldom have sound, objective, factual data regarding the performance of their teachers. No two people see the same thing when observing the teacher. Barr (3) and Ryans (25) found that two observers simultaneously watching the same teacher tend to see and to respond to quite different events within the total teaching situation. They concluded that differences in the observers' value systems had determined the differences in perception. If value systems differ, it will be highly probable that the purposes or goals of the teacher and the organization will be distorted.

The application of the evaluation process in schools today seems to ignore the evidence that has been accumulated regarding the problem of evaluation. There seems to be general acceptance of the assumptions that Chandler says must be made regardless of the method used. These assumptions are (a) that the qualities and characteristics of an ideal teacher are known, (b) that teaching conditions are either approximately the same in different situations or the differences are known and adequate adjustments can be made for them, and (c) that the evaluation instrument is equally reliable when used by different individuals and when applied under different circumstances (10). There seems to be an ignoring of the distortion that occurs when there is not an agreement between the administrator and the teacher as to the criteria which will be used to judge the results achieved. Popham points out that faced with the complexities resulting from divergent instructional objectives, those researchers studying classroom teaching procedures make a very critical mistake when they attempt to ferret out supposedly superior instructional procedures that could be used with equal efficacy by different teachers. The quality of learning in a given instructional situation is the result of particular instructional procedures employed by a particular instructor for particular students with particular goals in mind (24).

IV. Contributions to the Field of Evaluation

Many people in the fields of education, psychology, business, and industry have studied and researched the problem of employee performance evaluation. Popham maintains that we have not moved very far forward in our efforts to develop reliable measures of teacher effectiveness (23). In this light, it is necessary to look at some of the proposals that have been made and to attempt to glean from them some threads of continuity or a common denominator upon which a solution can be based.

McGregor has proposed a method of appraisal that he feels has a positive nature (20). The method is a shift from appraisal to analysis in which the subordinate becomes an active agent, not a passive object. The process involves the establishment of short term performance goals for himself by the employee based on a careful assessment of his own strengths and weaknesses. Together the employee and the administrator formulate specific plans for the accomplishment of his goals. The administrator helps the employee relate his self-appraisal, his goals, and his plans to the realities or goals of the organization. The process is culminated by an interview between the administrator and the employee to examine the employee's self-appraisal and to plan new goals for the next time period. This system places an emphasis on the future, not the past, and it is based on performance, not personality. Abstract concepts

such as neatness, dependability, adaptability, and initiative play a minor role. This method also reflects McGregor's belief that people have a desire to succeed, that they will work to achieve success, and that in so doing they will exercise self-control, will accept and seek out responsibility, will exercise creativity and productivity, and will work diligently to achieve corporate goals when they are provided with social and ego satisfactions.

Flannagan and Burns propose a method based on objective observation of an employee's performance followed by discussion with the employee of his strengths and weaknesses which can contribute to his development (13). The method is called the Critical Incidents Method and is based on an analysis of activities which are an outstanding contribution to productivity and morale or which are definitely detrimental. Observed and recorded performances based upon the critical requirements for the job provide an ideal basis for the evaluation. The record of performance is made by the employee himself, and the opinions and judgment of the evaluator play a minor role in making the record because only facts are recorded. This system was developed in an attempt to establish a set of standards which would make the result for a particular employee the same no matter who did the rating.

Adams proposes merit rating for the employees of an organization (1). This method requires the development of a good, complete job description prepared in cooperation with the employee to be evaluated. Personality traits are to be completely

avoided, and performance is to be evaluated on the basis of the achievement of established performance standards. Following appraisal, the employee has an interview with his superior for the purpose of discussing the rating, determining reasons for poor performance, and developing a plan of action.

In the specific area of education, Campbell has proposed a process of evaluation which would include (a) selection and definition of the particular phase of the total activity to be evaluated, (b) definition of criteria or basic assumptions upon which interpretations and judgments will be based, (c) collection of data related to the criteria, (d) analysis and interpretation of the data, and (e) the drawing of conclusions (8). Campbell emphasizes that a plan of action, based on the evaluation, needs to be developed and initiated before the evaluation will be of practical worth. He makes no specific proposal as to the exact method of establishing criteria of performance or how to measure the results after the performance has been observed.

McNeil lobbies strongly for an evaluation system based on the achievement of objectives (21). This system is based on two assumptions: Learning is evidenced by a change in the behavior of the student, and teaching is successful when the instructor's predetermined and intentional changes sought in the learner actually occur. McNeil contends that "we cannot teach what we cannot specify (21)." This implies that the teacher must select the appropriate changes to be sought in learners and then see that these changes are produced. These

assumptions, therefore, produce the need for the supervisor and teacher to agree in advance on what they will accept as evidence that the teacher has or has not been successful in changing the behavior of the students. If the objectives or goals have been formulated and the criteria for judgment established, there will be no ex post facto judgment of ends. Provision is also made for the modification of the objectives if the teacher has more important changes for the students or has overestimated their capacities. This method of evaluation is based upon the ability of the teacher to bring about the changes in student behavior that he has specified as important. The evaluator records a factual description of what takes place and collects evidence of the extent to which the desired results have occurred. It is important that inferences are avoided and that only factual data is recorded. This is important to the evaluator because after evaluation, he must be able to tell the teacher what to modify in his instructional procedures.

Fawcett proposes that evaluation should be a cooperative enterprise between the teacher and the administrator and that there should be a series of signals which both agree are indicators that the time for evaluation has arrived (12). Following this premise, he believes that criteria for expertness or inexpertness must be developed according to the nature of the goals established and that these criteria will serve as the indicators for evaluation which will confirm behavior or lead to redirection of behavior. Using this idea, Fawcett outlines a process of evaluation which includes the following steps:

(a) recognition of the need for evaluation, (b) conference between the administrator and the employee to establish the nature of the evaluation, (c) securing the assistance needed to carry out the evaluation, (d) provision for the evaluation to be carried out, and (e) evaluation of the data by the administrator, the employee, and the evaluator (12). The important point here is the idea that the recognition of one of the signals of success or malfunctioning is the determinant of when the evaluation is conducted, not a school district provision requiring evaluation at specific times.

From the above proposals, it seems that several items emerge that are necessary for efficient and satisfactory teacher evaluation. There must be agreement between the administrator and the teacher on what is to be judged. The teacher must know what is expected of him. This agreement should be reached cooperatively by the teacher and administrator, and the evaluation should be carried out by those close to the setting of objectives or performance standards. The teacher must be allowed to perform using many procedures to achieve his objectives. It is imperative that he know how well he is doing, which requires communication between the administrator and the teacher. There must be provision for the teacher to receive assistance as needed to achieve the objectives or goals that have been established cooperatively. It also seems imperative that evaluation must be based on performance, not personality. It must be future oriented with an emphasis on repetition of successful teaching techniques. It is also important that evaluation be continuous and cumulative and not be based upon isolated incidents.

V. Proposal for an Evaluation Technique

Using as a basis the threads which seem to run through the literature on evaluation, I would like to submit a proposal for a system of evaluation. Several questions have to be asked. How do we reinforce desirable behavior in teachers? How do we redirect undesirable behavior? Some assumptions also have to be made. McGregor is correct in his belief that people have a desire to succeed, will work to achieve success and in so doing will exercise self-control, will seek out responsibility, and will work diligently to achieve the goals of the organization when provided with social and ego satisfactions. The goals of the teacher and the school can be defined and spelled out in terms of pupil behavior changes which can be achieved through cooperative effort. The current methods of classroom observation based on a time schedule are inappropriate and ineffective.

The system would be based upon a carefully selected set of objectives for the learner to accomplish and upon an assessment of the skills, attitudes, and uses of knowledge exhibited by the teacher. These objectives would be developed cooperatively by the teacher and the administrator. McNeil states that when there are clear statements of objectives, learning is more effective and objectives are attained more readily. He also asserts that if there is no agreement on the ends of instruction, there can be no agreement regarding appropriate procedures and no fair

assessment of teacher effectiveness. Basic to this assertion are two assumptions: (a) Learning is evidenced by a change in behavior; and (b) teaching is successful when the instructor's predetermined and intentional changes sought in the learner actually occur (21). At this point there must also be agreement between the teacher and administrator as to what would be accepted as evidence that the teacher has or has not been successful in reaching the objectives stated in terms of learner behavior.

The teacher must be aware of the specific skills, attitudes, and uses of knowledge which will be essential to achieving the objectives that have been outlined for the students. This is an integral part of the evaluation system and must be kept flexible so that the administrator and teacher may adjust or modify any of the three as the determination of objective may require. A discussion of skills, attitudes, and uses of knowledge must always keep in mind the development of the teacher over a long period. Too much attention to short term objectives may not allow the teacher to develop his full potential.

An important variation from normal procedure is recommended at this point. I feel that the teacher should now be allowed to perform his role. All possible assistance should be given to him in his attempt to achieve the agree upon objectives. The supervisor and the teacher become partners in this system; therefore, advice is sought and accepted more readily. The agreement in advance of instruction on the objectives to be achieved and the evidence which will be accepted that the teacher has been successful in changing the behavior of students

counteract ex post facto judgments of ends. This results in a shift from judging according to procedures followed to judging according to the results produced in children.

It is important to note several problems that must be considered when implementing a program of evaluation by student achievement of instructional objectives. Bloom points out that the original formulation of objectives is usually quite ambiguous. This method of evaluation requires that the objectives be stated with sufficient precision that one can determine what evidence of student attainment is appropriate (6). It is imperative that as objectives are used and evidence is sought, they be modified and clarified so that evaluation evidence is relevant. In this way the objectives are improved and evaluation becomes more precise.

Popham reminds that when testing the effects of this program, it is important that the pretests and posttests based on the operational objectives be made sufficiently reliable and discriminating to serve the purpose. He also points out that some teachers may feel genuinely threatened by the prospect of having their competence assessed in terms of pupil achievement (24). Because of this feeling, there is the possibility of opposition to this method of evaluation of teacher effectiveness.

VI. Alternative Methods of Implementation

At this point it is appropriate to present three alternative methods of implementing and conducting evaluation of instruction based on prescribed objectives. The three methods presented all vary in some degree both in philosophy and in organization. A choice among the alternatives may be made as the situation demands.

Alternative #1

This alternative is a description of the experience of a junior college in developing and implementing this system of evaluation. The dean of instruction having made a commitment to this method of faculty evaluation was faced with the problem of securing volunteer faculty members. The prime ingredient was present: strong administrative support. With this support in hand, the dean of instruction sought faculty support. The proposal for this type of evaluation was advertised to the faculty. Having found fourteen teachers who volunteered to try this system, the dean of instruction developed the following procedure for getting the system underway:

(a) A first meeting between the dean of instruction, the division chairman, and a faculty member was held. At this meeting several questions were considered:

(1) What do you specifically expect your students to be able to do at the end of your course?

(2) What do you know about behavioral objectives?

(b) The faculty member was given instruction in the development of specific instructional objectives by a consultant and was assigned reading material: Mager, Preparing Instructional Objectives and Bloom, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives

(c) A second meeting was held with the dean of instruction, the division chairman, and the faculty member at which time a set of terminal objectives for a course were worked out and agreed upon. Once the objectives were cooperatively agreed upon, another important step was taken. Criterion were cooperatively established as to what evidence would be accepted that the students had met the prescribed objectives.

(d) A third meeting was held at the end of the year at which time the faculty member presented the accumulated evidence that related to the students' success or failure of achieving the prescribed objectives. At this point, three steps were taken:

(1) The evidence was examined in terms of the stated objectives.

(2) Modification was made, if necessary, in the original objectives.

(3) An examination was made of the techniques used in guiding the students toward the attainment of the objectives if problems had arisen.

The major attraction in this proposal was a way to avoid the traditional method of faculty evaluation: classroom visitation. Several faculty members reported that they were skeptical at first for two reasons: (a) suspicion of a new idea that the administrators had latched on to and (b) a lack of understanding of the jargon that accompanied the proposal.

At this point it is important to consider some of the ideas that developed in conjunction with the use of this system as seen by the administrators and faculty. These ideas are broken down by the headings of dean of instruction, division chairman, and faculty members.

Dean of Instruction:

(a) This system should be implemented one course at a time for each instructor involved.

(b) No attempt should be made to involve all instructors at one time.

(c) Terminal objectives, as defined by Mager and Cohen, should be stressed at first and work backward to unit objectives.

(d) In order to influence other faculty members, you have to build up this system. Some techniques used were:

(1) Make stars of the participants.

(2) Use participants in the selection of instructional equipment and supplies.

(3) Assign laboratory aides to participating instructors.

(c) There must be ultimate responsibility placed on the instructor in order to force carry-through of the system.

Division Chairman:

(a) This system forces the instructor to develop behavioral objectives and forces responsibility.

(b) More frequent evaluation of evidence would be helpful in the modification of objectives.

(c) There should be other means of evaluation for new teachers, specifically for those courses not being conducted on the basis of instructional objectives.

Faculty Members:

(a) This system forces the instructor to define specifically what he wants the students to gain from the course.

(b) The most effective influence on non-participants is the comments of participating faculty members.

(c) New teachers are the easiest to approach.

(d) The opportunities for in-service training must be utilized.

Alternative #2

The method proposed in this alternative will closely approximate the method used in Alternative #1. There is, however, one critical difference. Alternative #1 included in its basic framework a complete absence of classroom visitation. In Alternative #2 it is proposed that classroom visitation receive prime attention.

The basic premise for including classroom visitation in this scheme is that it will provide more frequent and rapid feedback to the instructor. Banathy proposes that the systems approach requires rapid feedback so that outcomes may be checked and procedures may be revised in the appropriate areas (2).

The visitation method to be used in this alternative is one proposed by McNeil (21). It is important to note that this procedure must be based upon the recording of factual data and a descriptive record of teaching. At no time should judgment enter into the recording of what happened in the classroom. To this end, McNeil has developed a rating and observation form which can be used to record factual data as they relate to the agreed upon objectives established by the dean, the division chairman, and the instructor. Below is shown the form for rating and observation.

RATING AND OBSERVATION FORM

1. Agreement upon tentative objectives of instruction

   A. List below the measures, observations, or indicators of quality in a pupil's product (e.g., theme) that will be accepted as evidence that the teacher is to receive a rating of outstanding, good, or poor. (What must pupils accomplish in order for the teacher to get a grade of outstanding? What have the supervisor and teacher agreed upon as evidence that pupils have or have not made desired progress?)

   B. Indicate the kinds of situations to which pupils will be expected to respond differently from that response presently in their repertoire. (e.g., Given any Spanish word ending in ar, pupils will correctly conjugate the verb in the present tense.)

2. Facts which will be collected for describing the teacher's instructional procedures.

Principle	Facts to be collected
A. Reinforcement (reward system)	Percentage of pupils whose papers receive positive comments for correct performance.
B. Individualization	Number of alternative assignments available to class.
C. Opportunity to practice behavior desired	Number of times each pupil was called upon for oral response.
D. Prompting	Examples presented before requiring learners to generate the rule. Number of responses demanded from learners without presence of teacher prompting or cueing.

E. Other -- The supervisor may use any principle or theoretical framework that will direct attention to factual observation in the classroom.
The utility of the principle is validated when it leads to the teacher's subsequent changing specific aspects of instruction and to the consequence of greater pupil gain in desired directions.

The use of this method will accomplish two things of great importance: (a) Immediate feedback that is valuable in the modification of either the specified objectives or the techniques used to achieve the desired student behavior changes is available to the instructor, and (b) it provides intermediate factual checks on the teacher's progress toward his goals by a competent outside observer.

Alternative #3

This alternative includes a drastic move from the above cited methods. The same rationale obtains, but a different emphasis is placed on organizing the staff for implementation of the evaluation system and on fixing responsibility for student attainment of the cooperatively agreed upon objectives.

If the dean of instruction is dedicated to faculty evaluation on the basis of student achievement of instructional objectives, it will be difficult for him to conduct the traditional classroom visitation for those instructors who do not wish to participate. The basic responsibility factor will be set by a contractual agreement between the dean of instruction and the instructor which establishes the base for evaluation and the evidence that will be accepted of student attainment of the objectives. To implement this system and to assure that all instructors will be assessed on the same basis, the students will be given pretests and posttests and the results will be used as evidence of the effectiveness of the teacher, whether or not they are voluntary participants in this type of teacher evaluation.

Popham warns that there is a difficulty in developing pretests and posttests based on operational objectives which are sufficiently reliable and discriminating to serve the purpose of teacher evaluation (24). In view of this warning, it is important that great care go into developing the tests that become a basis for teacher evaluation. This warning, however, must not keep this method from being tried. The society at large evaluates the end product of our educational system regardless of the evaluation scheme used in the schools. It is imperative, therefore, that teachers who resist placing their competency on the line in a new way be forced to do so in some manner so that they are judged on the basis of student achievement.

The participating instructors would, under this alternative, follow the process listed below starting with a pre-school in-service training session.

(a) First meeting to determine what the instructor knows about behavioral objectives, to discuss what the instructor expects his students to be able to do upon completion of the course, and to assign reading material on the preparation of instructional objectives.

(b) Second meeting to present instruction on the development and use of instructional objectives by a consultant who is experienced in this instructional method.

(c) Cooperative formation of terminal instructional objectives for each course offered at the college by the dean of instruction, the division chairmen, and participating instructors.

(d) Upon completion of the formation of the instructional objectives, development of pretests which are based on the specified objectives prior to the opening of school.

(e) Administration of the pretests.

(f) Classroom visitation of participating instructors for the purpose of factual recording of the teacher progress toward the student achievement of the objectives and the possible modification of objectives or instructional techniques.

(g) Development of posttests which will provide evidence of student achievement based on the prescribed objectives.

(h) Administration of posttests in order to accumulate the desired evidence of student achievement.

(i) Evaluation of teacher effectiveness based on the results of student scores on the posttest and a discussion of possible modifications in objectives, instructional techniques, and composition of the pretests and posttests.

This alternative may be a very threatening one to many faculty members and administrators who have been conditioned by the traditional method of faculty evaluation. It is observed by Popham, however, that by stipulating identical objectives to be achieved but permitting teacher diversity in the means used to accomplish these ends, a method of evaluation of teacher performance is provided without restricting individualistic teaching style (24). This provision may allay many of the fears instructors will voice. As to the concern by administrators for an intrusion on their evaluation domain, they must face the fact that research has shown that the traditional methods of evaluation produce very little reliable data (3 and 21) and that an attempt must be made to secure meaningful data on teacher effectiveness.

VII. SUMMARY

If, as Bloom has suggested, education exists for the purpose of providing experiences that change the thoughts, feelings, and actions of students, it is imperative that the objectives of education be stated in behavioral terms (6). Once specified, these objectives provide a baseline by which teacher effectiveness may be assessed.

I believe that it is important to sound certain warnings, however. It must be kept in mind that the problem of developing the most satisfactory instructor evaluation method will not be resolved easily. The above described method appears to offer a more objective base upon which self-evaluation may be built. It allows teacher actions to be seen relative to goal achievement, not in relation to personal characteristics. In addition, it provides that the establishment of objectives to be achieved and the standards of acceptable performance are to be arrived at cooperatively by the teacher and the administrator.

If these provisions are kept in mind, this method will provide better communication between the administrator, the instructor, and the students. Built in are ways in which teacher behavior may be confirmed or redirected, which leads to the achievement of the specified goals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adams, H.F. "Merit Rating for Personnel Development." Journal of the American Society of Training Directors. Vol. 13, No. 9 (September, 1959).

2. Banathy, Bela. Instructional Systems. Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1968.

3. Barr, A. S. Wisconsin Studies of the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness; A Summary of Investigations. Madison, Wisconsin: Dembar Publications, Inc., 1961.

4. Blake, Robert R. "Re-examination of Performance Appraisal." Advanced Management. Vol. 23, No. 7 (July, 1958).

5. Blocker, Clyde E. "Are Our Faculties Competent?" Junior College Journal. Vol. 36, No. 4 (December, 1965), pp. 12-17.

6. Bloom, B. S. "How May the Special Contributions of Liberal Arts Education Be Evaluated?" Current Issues in Higher Education. Association for Higher Education, 1954, pp. 281-283.

7. Boyce, A. C. "Methods of Measuring Teacher Efficiency." National Society for the Study of Education, Fourteenth Yearbook, Pt. I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1915.

8. Campbell, Roald and Gregg, Russell. Administrative Behavior in Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

9. Castetter, William B. Administering the School Personnel Program. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962.

10. Chandler, B. J. and Petty, Paul V. Personnel Management in School Administration. New York: World Book Company, 1955.

11. Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

12. Fawcett, Claude W. School Personnel Administration. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964.

13. Flannagan, John C. and Burns, Robert K. "The Employee Performance Record: A New Appraisal and Development Tool." Harvard Business Review. Vol. 33, No. 5 (September-October, 1955).

14. Good, Carter V. (ed.). Dictionary of Education. (Second Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc., 1959.

15. Heald, James E. and Moore, Samuel A., II. The Teacher and Administrative Relationships in School Systems. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968.

16. Howsam, Robert. Who's A Good Teacher? Joint Committee on Personnel Procedures of the California School Boards Association and the California Teachers Association, 1960.

17. Litterer, Joseph A. "The Self Critique in Performance Appraisal." Journal of the American Society of Training Directors. Vol. 12, No. 10, (October, 1958).

18. Lucio, William H. and McNeil, John D. Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.

19. Machaver, William V. and Erickson, Willard E. "A New Approach to Executive Appraisal." Personnel. Vol. 35, No. 1, (July-August, 1958).

20. McGregor, Douglas. "An Uneasy Look at Performance Appraisals." Harvard Business Review. Vol. 35, No. 3, (May-June, 1957).

21. McNeil, John D. "Antidote to a School Scandal." The Educational Forum. (November, 1966).

22. Odiorne, George. Personnel Policy: Issues and Practice. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1963.

23. Popham, James W. Development of a Performance Test of Teaching Proficiency. University of California, Los Angeles, (August, 1967).

24. Popham, W. James. "The Performance Test: A New Approach to the Assessment of Teaching Proficiency." The Journal of Teacher Education. Vol. 19, No. 2 (Summer, 1968), pp. 216-222.

25. Ryans, D. G. Characteristics of Teachers. Washington, D. C. American Council on Education, 1960.

26. Sorenson, Garth and Cross, Cecily F. Teacher Appraisal: A Matching Process. Center for the Study of Evaluation of Instructional Programs, Occasional Report. University of California, Los Angeles, (April, 1967).

27. Stahl, Glenn O. Public Personnel Administration (Fifth Edition). New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.

28. Tiffin, Joseph. "Six Merit Rating Systems." Personnel Journal. Vol. 37, No. 8 (January, 1959).

29. Whitehill, Arthur M. Personnel Relations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1955.

INTERVIEWS

Shawl, William. Dean of Instruction, Golden West College, Huntington Beach, California

Freligh, Edith. Division Chairman - Communications, Golden West College, Huntington Beach, California

Gripp, Tom. Instructor - Communications Division (English), Golden West College, Huntington Beach, California

Thames, Anna Marie. Instructor - Communications Division (English), Golden West College, Huntington Beach, California